The Applicant, Ambling Development Group, submits the following reply to the City of Bellingham’s Response to Applicant’s Motion for Reconsideration (the “Response”). Because the City fails to rebut any of the legal or factual arguments put forth in the Applicant’s Motion to Reconsider (the “Motion”), the Hearing Examiner should disregard the Response entirely, and grant the Motion.

The City of Bellingham (the “City”) does not substantively respond to the Motion. No analysis or justification is provided in support of its position. Instead, the City merely states that it disagrees with the Applicant.

More importantly, the Response is a complete departure from the City’s position in its Staff Report, at the hearing, and in its Post-Hearing Comment. The City’s Staff Report and the Post-Hearing Comment provided a robust analysis of the benefit and appropriateness of the Boarding and Rooming House use for the Project.¹ Both recommend

¹ See City’s Staff Report, Section V – Code Analysis, pg. 15. See also City’s Post-Hearing Comment, Permitted Use/Density, pgs. 2-3.
approval of the Boarding and Rooming House use for the Project. To the extent the City now departs from that position, it should be judicially estopped from doing so.

The City provides its interpretation of the Hearing Examiner’s Decision (the “Decision”) ruling on the additional height restriction, based on the Puget Street centerline. This argument by the City actually supports reconsideration, as it demonstrates the need for a clear rule on the additional height restriction. The Decision leaves open too many avenues for interpretation, which lead to uncertainty and delay. The City’s opinion is only one of many possible interpretations of the additional height restriction imposed in the Decision. Thus, the Hearing Examiner should reconsider its decision and impose a height restriction as outlined by the Applicant in its motion.

The Applicant respectfully requests that the Hearing Examiner GRANT the Applicant’s Motion for Reconsideration.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 12th day of November 2013.

BELCHER SWANSON LAW FIRM, PLLC

BRADLEY D. SWANSON, WSBA #37157
Attorney for Applicant

---

2 The Response is more like an acceptance of the Hearing Examiner’s Decision than opposition to the Applicant’s Motion.
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